

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	ī	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/633,419		08/04/2003	Naoya Nakanishi	SNY-037	SNY-037 2557		
20374	7590	05/25/2006		EXAMINER			
KUBOVC	IK & KU	BOVCIK		CREPEAU, JONATHAN			
SUITE 710 900 17TH S		IW		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
WASHING	TON, DO	C 20006		1746			
				DATE MAILED: 05/25/200	6		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
		1	
	10/633,419	NAKANISHI ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jonathan S. Crepeau	1746	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with th	e correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	PATE OF THIS COMMUNICATE 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply b will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fe, cause the application to become ABANDO	ON. e timely filed rom the mailing date of this communicat DNED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>04 A</u>	August 2003.		
	s action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa	ince except for formal matters,	prosecution as to the merits	is
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11,	453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-5</u> is/are pending in the application.			
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra	wn from consideration.		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-5</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.		
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on 04 August 2003 is/are:	a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objecte	ed to by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance.	See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	tion is required if the drawing(s) is	objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121	I(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	xaminer. Note the attached Off	ice Action or form PTO-152.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreigr a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:	n priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	(a)-(d) or (f).	
1. Certified copies of the priority document	ts have been received.		
2. Certified copies of the priority document	• •		
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	•	eived in this National Stage	
application from the International Burea	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not rece	ived.	
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summ		
 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) 	Paper No(s)/Mai 5) Notice of Information	Date I Date I Patent Application (PTO-152)	
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/4/03</u> .	6) Other:	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	

Application/Control Number: 10/633,419 Page 2

Art Unit: 1746

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 2. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Shimamura et al (U.S. Patent 7,008,720). The reference teaches a battery comprising a can (3) and having positive and negative terminals (8, 9, respectively). As disclosed in column 8, line 32, one of the terminals has a coating preferably comprising Ni. As disclosed in column 8, line 27, one or both terminals may be made from stainless steel. Since stainless steel of the austenitic type comprises nickel, it is submitted that the subject matter of claims 1 and 2 is at least rendered obvious by Shimamura et al. since both the body of one terminal would comprise nickel and the coating on the opposite polarity terminal would also comprise nickel.

It is noted that this rejection may be obviated by the filing of a certified translation of the priority document.

Application/Control Number: 10/633,419 Page 3

Art Unit: 1746

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanafusa et al (U.S. Patent 6,531,246) in view of Yageta et al (U.S. Pre-Grant Publication No. 2002/0146621).

Hanafusa teaches a battery comprising a can (1) and having positive and negative terminals (21, 20). The battery can may be made of aluminum (see col. 8, line 26) or stainless steel (col. 6, line 23). As shown in Figure 7, the terminal 21 is in contact with a coating layer comprising the can material (5). As shown in Figure 15, the terminal 20 is coated with a material (17b) comprising nickel, copper, or aluminum (see col. 11, line 45).

The reference does not expressly teach the base material composition of the terminals as recited in claims 1, 3, and 5.

Yageta et al. is directed to a secondary battery. In paragraph [0059], the reference teaches the following:

[0059] There is no particular limitation to available materials for the positive electrode lead terminal 31 and the negative electrode lead terminal 32. The know materials are

available. For example, aluminum or aluminum alloys are available for the positive electrode lead terminal 31, whilst nickel, copper and alloys thereof are also available for the negative electrode lead terminal 32.

Application/Control Number: 10/633,419

Art Unit: 1746

Page 4

Therefore, the invention as a whole would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made because the artisan would be motivated to use aluminum as the positive terminal and copper or nickel as the negative terminal of Hanafusa et al. The disclosure of Yageta et al. indicates that these are suitable materials for use as positive and negative terminals. The selection of a known material based on its suitability for its intended use has generally been held to be *prima facie* obvious (MPEP §2144.07). Taking terminal 21 of Hanafusa to be the positive terminal and terminal 20 to be the negative terminal, with regard to claim 3, this would result in an aluminum battery can, a nickel or copper negative terminal (20), and a coating layer (17b) of aluminum (see Fig. 15). Regarding claim 5, the can may be stainless steel, the positive terminal (21) would be aluminum, and the coating layer on the positive terminal (21) would also be stainless steel (see Fig. 7). As such, the subject matter of claims 1-5 would be rendered obvious.

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jonathan Crepeau whose telephone number is (571) 272-1299. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Friday from 9:30 AM - 6:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Ryan, can be reached at (571) 272-1292. The phone number for the

Application/Control Number: 10/633,419 Page 5

Art Unit: 1746

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 272-1700. Documents

may be faxed to the central fax server at (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jonathan Crepeau Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1746

May 23, 2006